

features of Claim 1 - does not define a contribution over the prior art. To support this assertion, the Office states: "Evidence of lack of unity between the groups is found in Suzuki US 4718152, wherein it is found to disclose the features of instant claim 1." However, the Examiner has not provide sufficient reasons and/or explanations to support such an assertion. In particular, Applicants note that the Examiner has not specified how this assertion relates to the bulky sheet of Group I, other than stating its conclusion. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the assertion by the Examiner is inadequate to support the present Restriction Requirement.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully traverse on the grounds that the Office has not shown that a burden exists in searching the entire application.

MPEP in §803 states as follows:

"If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without a serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions."

Applicants respectfully submit that a search of all the claims would not impose a serious burden on the Office.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants contend that the Restriction Requirement is improper and should be withdrawn.

RECEIVED
MAR 10 2003
GROUP 1700

Applicants respectfully submit that the above-identified application is now in condition for examination on the merits, and early notice of such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Norman F. Oblon
Attorney of Record
Registration No.: 24,618

Vincent K. Shier, Ph.D.
Registration No.: 50,552



22850

PHONE: (703) 413-3000
FAX: (703) 413-2220
NFO:VKS
E:\212209US0PCT-RR resp.wpd